arXiv:1703.06872v1 [math.PR] 20 Mar 2017

The SK model is Full-step Replica Symmetry Breaking at zero temperature

Antonio Auffinger *
Northwestern University

Wei-Kuo Chen †
University of Minnesota

Qiang Zeng ‡
Northwestern University

March 21, 2017

Abstract

We prove that the Parisi measure of the mixed p-spin model at zero temperature has infinitely many points in its support. This establishes Parisi's prediction that the functional order parameter of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model is not a step function at zero temperature. As a consequence, we show that the number of levels of broken replica symmetry in the Parisi formula of the free energy diverges as the temperature goes to zero.

1 Introduction and main results

The study of glass and mean field or realistic spin glass models is a very rich and important part of theoretical physics [13, 14, 23]. For mathematicians, it is a challenging program [17, 27, 29]. Roughly speaking, the main goal is to study the global maxima or, more generally, the "largest individuals" of a stochastic process with "high-dimensional" correlation structure.

The classic example of such a process is the mixed p-spin model. Its Hamiltonian (or energy) H_N is defined on the spin configuration space $\Sigma_N = \{-1, 1\}^N$ by

$$H_N(\sigma) = X_N(\sigma) + h\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i.$$

Here, $h \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the strength of the external field and X_N is a centered Gaussian process with covariance,

$$\mathbb{E}X_N(\sigma^1)X_N(\sigma^2) = N\xi(R_{1,2}),$$

where

$$\xi(s) := \sum_{p\geq 2} c_p^2 s^p$$

for some real sequence $(c_p)_{p\geq 2}$ with $\sum_{p\geq 2} 2^p c_p^2 < \infty$ and

$$R_{1,2} = R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^1\sigma_i^2$$

*Department of Mathematics, Northwestern University, tuca@northwestern.edu, research partially supported by NSF Grant CAREER DMS-1653552 and NSF Grant DMS-1517894.

†School of Mathematics, University of Minnesota. Email: wkchen@umn.edu, research partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1642207 and Hong Kong Research Grants Council GRF-14302515.

‡Department of Mathematics, Northwestern University, qzeng.math@gmail.com.

is the normalized inner product between σ^1 and σ^2, known as the overlap. The covariance structure of X_N is as rich as the structure of the metric space (Σ_N, d), where d is the Hamming distance on Σ_N,

$$d(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) = \frac{1 - R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)}{2}.$$

The problem of computing the maximum energy (or the ground state energy) of H_N as N diverges is a rather nontrivial task. Standard statistical mechanics deals with this problem by considering the Gibbs measure

$$G_{N,\beta}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z_{N,\beta}} e^{\beta H_N(\sigma)}$$

and the free energy

$$F_{N,\beta} = \frac{1}{\beta N} \log Z_{N,\beta},$$

where $Z_{N,\beta}$ is the partition function of H_N defined as

$$Z_{N,\beta} = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_N} e^{\beta H_N(\sigma)}.$$

The parameter $\beta = 1/(kT) > 0$ is called the inverse temperature, where k is the Boltzmann constant and T is the absolute temperature. The main goal in this approach is to try to describe the large N limit of the sequences of the free energies $F_{N,\beta}$ and the Gibbs measures $G_{N,\beta}$. When the temperature T decreases, large values of H_N become more important (to both the partition function $Z_{N,\beta}$ and to the Gibbs measure $G_{N,\beta}$) and they prevail over the more numerous smaller values. Since H_N is a high-dimensional correlated field with a large number of points near its global maximum, this question becomes very challenging, especially for small values of T.

When $\xi(s) = s^2/2$ and $h = 0$, the model above is the famous Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model introduced in [25], as a mean field modification of the Edwards-Anderson model [10]. Using a non-rigorous replica trick and a replica symmetric hypothesis, Sherrington and Kirkpatrick [25] proposed a solution to the limiting free energy of the SK model. Their solution however was incomplete; an alternative solution was proposed in 1979 in a series of ground-breaking articles by Giorgio Parisi [19–22], where it was foreseen that:

(i) The limiting free energy is given by a variational principle, known as the Parisi formula,

(ii) The Gibbs measures are asymptotically ultrametric,

(iii) At low temperature, the symmetry of replicas is broken infinitely many times.

The first two predictions were confirmed in the past decade. Following the beautiful discovery of Guerra's broken replica symmetry scheme [12], the Parisi formula was proved in the seminal work of Talagrand [28] in 2006 under the convexity assumption of ξ. Later, in 2012, the ultrametricity conjecture was established by Panchenko [16] assuming the validity of the extended Ghirlanda-Guerra identities [11]. These identities are known to be valid for the SK model under an asymptotically vanishing perturbation term to the Hamiltonian, and for generic models without any perturbation. As a consequence of ultrametricity, the Parisi formula was further extended to generic models by Panchenko [18] utilizing the Aizenman-Sims-Starr scheme [6]. Our main result in this paper confirms the third prediction at zero temperature, $T = 0$.

More precisely, the Parisi formula is stated as follows. Denote by $\mathcal{M}$ the collection of all cumulative distribution functions α on $[0,1]$ and by $\alpha(ds)$ the probability induced by α. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$, define

$$\mathcal{P}_\beta(\alpha) = \frac{\log 2}{\beta} + \Psi_{\alpha,\beta}(0,h) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \beta\alpha(s)s\xi''(s)ds, \tag{1}$$

where $\Psi_{\alpha,\beta}(t,x)$ is the weak solution to the following nonlinear parabolic PDE,

$$\partial_t \Psi_{\alpha,\beta}(t,x) = -\frac{\xi''(t)}{2}\big(\partial_{xx}\Psi_{\alpha,\beta}(t,x) + \beta\alpha(t)(\partial_x \Psi_{\alpha,\beta}(t,x))^2\big)$$

for $(t,x) \in [0,1) \times \mathbb{R}$ with boundary condition

$$\Psi_{\alpha,\beta}(1,x) = \frac{\log\cosh \beta x}{\beta}.$$

For the existence and regularity of $\Psi_{\alpha,\beta}$, we refer the readers to [3,15]. The Parisi formula [28] states that

$$F_\beta := \lim_{N\to\infty} F_{N,\beta} = \inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_\beta(\alpha) \quad a.s. \tag{2}$$

The infinite dimensional variational problem on the right side of (2) has a unique minimizer [3], denoted by $\alpha_{P,\beta}$. The measure $\alpha_{P,\beta}(dt)$ induced by $\alpha_{P,\beta}$ is known as the Parisi measure [13][1]. Its physical relevance is described by the facts that it is the limiting distribution of the overlap $R(\sigma^1,\sigma^2)$ under the measure $\mathbb{E}G_N^{\otimes 2}$ and, more importantly, that it determines the ultrametric description of the asymptotic Gibbs measure. For instance, the number of points in the support of the Parisi measure corresponds to the number of levels in the tree structure induced by the ultrametricity of the asymptotic Gibbs measure. See [13,17] for detailed discussion.

The importance of the Parisi measure leads to the following classification. If a Parisi measure $\alpha_{P,\beta}(dt)$ is a Dirac measure, we say that the model is replica symmetric (RS). For $k \geq 1$, we say that the model has k levels of replica symmetry breaking (k-RSB) if the Parisi measure is atomic and has exactly $k+1$ jumps. If the Parisi measure is neither RS nor k-RSB for some $k \geq 1$, then the model has full-step replica symmetry breaking (FRSB). We will also say that the model is at least k-RSB if the Parisi measure contains at least $k+1$ distinct values in its support.

The FRSB prediction in (*iii*) above plays an inevitable role in Parisi's original solution of the SK model; see [9] for a historic account. It can be written as:

Prediction (Parisi)**.** *For any ξ and h, there exists a critical inverse temperature $\beta_c > 0$ such that for any $\beta > \beta_c$, the mixed p-spin model is FRSB.*

In this paper, we establish this prediction at zero temperature. To prepare for the statement of our main result, we recall the Parisi formula for the ground state energy of H_N as follows. First of all, the Parisi formula allows us to compute the ground state energy of the model by sending the temperature T to zero,

$$GSE := \lim_{N\to\infty}\max_{\sigma\in\Sigma_N}\frac{H_N(\sigma)}{N} = \lim_{\beta\to\infty} F_\beta = \lim_{\beta\to\infty}\inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{P}_\beta(\alpha), \tag{3}$$

where the validity of the first equality can be found, for instance, in Panchenko's book [17, Chapter 1]. Recently, the analysis of the β-limit of the second equality was carried out in Auffinger-Chen [4]

[1]The Parisi measure is the inverse of the functional order parameter $q(x)$ in [20], sometimes written as $x(q)$.

and it was discovered that the ground state energy can be written as a Parisi-type formula. Let $\mathcal{U}$ denote the collection of all cumulative distribution functions γ on $[0,1)$ induced by any measures on $[0,1)$ and satisfying $\int_0^1 \gamma(t)dt < \infty$. Denote by $\gamma(dt)$ the measure that induces γ and endow $\mathcal{U}$ with the $L^1(dt)$-distance. For each $\gamma \in \mathcal{U}$, consider the weak solution to the Parisi PDE,

$$\partial_t \Psi_\gamma(t,x) = -\frac{\xi''(t)}{2}\big(\partial_{xx}\Psi_\gamma(t,x) + \gamma(t)(\partial_x \Psi_\gamma(t,x))^2\big)$$

for $(t,x) \in [0,1) \times \mathbb{R}$ with boundary condition

$$\Psi_\gamma(1,x) = |x|.$$

One may find the existence and regularity properties of this PDE solution in [7]. The Parisi functional at zero temperature is given by

$$\mathcal{P}(\gamma) = \Psi_\gamma(0,h) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 t\xi''(t)\gamma(t)dt. \tag{4}$$

Auffinger and Chen [4] proved that the maximum energy can be computed through

$$GSE = \inf_{\gamma \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{P}(\gamma) \quad a.s. \tag{5}$$

We call this variational representation the Parisi formula at zero temperature. It was proved in [7] that this formula has a unique minimizer, denote by γ_P. We call $\gamma_P(dt)$ the Parisi measure at zero temperature. We say that the model is FRSB at zero temperature if $\gamma_P(dt)$ contains infinitely many points in its support. Our first main result is a proof of Parisi's FRSB prediction at zero temperature.

Theorem 1. *For any ξ and h, the mixed p-spin model at zero temperature is FRSB.*

Similar to the role of the Parisi measure at positive temperature played in describing the behavior of the model, the Parisi measure at zero temperature also has its own relevance in understanding the energy landscape of the Hamiltonian around the maximum energy. Indeed, consider the mixed even p-spin model, i.e., $c_p = 0$ for all odd $p \geq 3$. It can be shown that for any $\varepsilon, \eta > 0$ and any u in the support of $\gamma_P(dt)$, there exists some constant $K > 0$ independent of N such that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\exists \sigma^1, \sigma^2 \text{ such that } R_{1,2} \in (u-\varepsilon, u+\varepsilon) \text{ and } \frac{H_N(\sigma^1)}{N}, \frac{H_N(\sigma^2)}{N} \geq GSE - \eta\Big) \geq 1 - Ke^{-\frac{N}{K}} \tag{6}$$

for all $N \geq 1$. This means that for any $u \in \operatorname{supp} \gamma_P$, one can always find two spin configurations around the maximum energy such that their overlap is near u with overwhelming probability. The display (6) can be carried out by means of the Guerra-Talagrand replica symmetry breaking bound for the maximum coupled energy with overlap constraint (see [7, Subsection 3.1] and [5]). Now knowing that the model is FRSB by Theorem 1 indicates that the spin configurations around the maximum energy are not simply clustered into equidistant groups. This is in sharp contrast to the energy landscape of the spherical version of the mixed p-spin model, where in the pure p-spin model, i.e., $\xi(t) = t^p$ for $p \geq 3$, it was shown by Subag [26] that around the maximum energy, the spin configurations are essentially orthogonally structured. This structure was also presented in more general mixtures of the spherical model in the recent work of Auffinger and Chen [5].

Remark 1. The problem of computing the maximum energy is also generally known as the Dean's problem and is frequently used to motivate the theory of mean field spin glasses, see [13, 17]. More recently, the formula (3) has appeared in other optimization problems related to theoretical computer science such as extremal cuts on sparse random graphs, see [8, 24] and the references therein.

We now return to the positive temperature case. Recall the Parisi measure $\alpha_{P,\beta}$ introduced in (2). Our second main result, as a consequence of Theorem 1, shows that for any mixture parameter ξ and external field h, the number of levels of replica symmetry breaking must diverge as β goes to infinity.

Theorem 2. *Let $k \geq 1$. For any ξ and h, there exists β_k such that the mixed p-spin model is at least k-RSB for all $\beta > \beta_k$.*

We finish this section with some historical remarks and describing the main novelty of our approach. For the SK model without external field, the Parisi measure was shown to be RS in the high temperature regime $\beta < 1$ by Aizenman, Lebowitz, and Ruelle [1]. Later, it was also understood by Toninelli [30] that the Parisi measure is not RS in the low temperature region $\beta > 1$. The whole region $\beta > 1$ is expected to be of FRSB. Before Theorem 2, the state of the art towards Parisi's FRSB prediction was given in [2, Theorem 3], where the authors established that for sufficiently low temperature the mixed p-spin model with $h = 0$ is at least 2-RSB. It is also believed that the functional ordered parameter $\alpha_{P,\beta}$ is not only FRSB at low temperature, but also has an absolutely continuous part [13, Chapter III]. Regularity properties of Parisi measures can be found in [2].

The main novelty of our approach to Theorem 1 is to explore the Parisi formula for the ground state energy (5) by considering a perturbation around the point 1. In short, we show that it is always possible to lower the value of the Parisi functional of any atomic measure with finite atoms by adding a large enough jump near 1. At finite temperature, since the Parisi measure is a probability measure, the idea of adding a large jump is not feasible. As the reader will see, some miraculous cancellations (see Lemma 2 and Proposition 2 among others) occur during the proof. These cancellations mostly come from exact computations that use the fact that the boundary condition of Ψ_γ at 1 is $|x|$. Theorem 2 follows from Theorem 1 after some weak convergence considerations.

2 Lowering the value of the Parisi functional

In this section, we show that for any atomic $\gamma(ds)$ with finitely many jumps, one can always lower the value of the Parisi functional by a perturbation of γ around 1. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{U}$ be fixed. Suppose that $\gamma(dt)$ is atomic and consists of finitely many jumps, that is,

$$\gamma(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m_i \mathbf{1}_{[q_i, q_{i+1})}(t) + m_n \mathbf{1}_{[q_n, 1)}(t),$$

where $(q_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ and $(m_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} &0 = q_0 < q_1 < q_2 < \cdots < q_n < 1, \\ &0 \leq m_0 < m_1 < m_2 < \cdots < m_n < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Here and in what follows, $\mathbf{1}_B(t) = \mathbf{1}_{[t \in B]}$ is the indicator function of the set $B \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let m_{n+1} be any number greater than m_n. For any $q \in (q_n, 1)$, consider a perturbation of γ by

$$\gamma_q(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m_i \mathbf{1}_{[q_i, q_{i+1})}(t) + m_n \mathbf{1}_{[q_n, q)}(t) + m_{n+1} \mathbf{1}_{[q,1)}(t). \tag{8}$$

In other words, we add a jump to the top of γ. Our main result is the following theorem. It says that if m_{n+1} is large enough, then the Parisi functional evaluated at perturbed measure $\gamma_q(dt)$ has a smaller value than $\mathcal{P}(\gamma)$ locally for q near 1.

Theorem 3. *There exist $m_{n+1} > m_n$ and $\eta \in (q_n, 1)$ such that*

$$\mathcal{P}(\gamma_q) < \mathcal{P}(\gamma)$$

for all $\eta \le q < 1$.

The following three subsections are devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.

2.1 Probabilistic representation of $\mathcal{P}$

We start by observing that the Parisi functional at γ admits a probabilistic expression by an application of the Cole-Hopf transformation to the Parisi PDE. Indeed, let $z_0, \dots, z_n$ be i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables. Denote

$$J = h + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} z_i \sqrt{\xi'(q_{i+1}) - \xi'(q_i)} + z_n \sqrt{\xi'(1) - \xi'(q_n)}.$$

Set

$$X_{n+1} = |J|.$$

Define iteratively, for $0 \le i \le n$,

$$X_i = \frac{1}{m_i} \log \mathbb{E}_{z_i} \exp m_i X_{i+1}.$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{z_i}$ stands for the expectation for z_i. Here X_0 is defined as $\mathbb{E}_{z_0} X_1$ if $m_0 = 0$. Then $\Psi_\gamma(0, h) = X_0$ and thus,

$$\mathcal{P}(\gamma) = X_0 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m_i \int_{q_i}^{q_{i+1}} t\xi''(t)dt - \frac{m_n}{2} \int_{q_n}^{1} t\xi''(t)dt.$$

Recall the perturbation γ_q from (8). Clearly $\gamma_q = \gamma$ on $[0, q)$ for all $q_n < q < 1$. For notational convenience, we denote

$$q_{n+1} = q, \ \ q_{n+2} = 1. \tag{9}$$

In a similar manner, by applying the Cole-Hopf transformation, we can express $\Psi_{\gamma_q}(0, h)$ as follows. Let z_{n+1} be a standard Gaussian random variables independent of $z_1, \dots, z_n$. Define

$$Y_{n+2} = \left| h + \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} z_j \sqrt{\xi'(q_{j+1}) - \xi'(q_j)} \right|$$

and iteratively, for $0 \le i \le n+1$,

$$Y_i = \frac{1}{m_i} \log \mathbb{E}_{z_i} \exp m_i Y_{i+1}.$$

Here again we let $Y_0 = \mathbb{E}_{z_0} Y_1$ whenever $m_0 = 0$. Thus, $\Psi_{\gamma_q}(0, h) = Y_0$ for any $q \in (q_n, 1)$. As a result,

$$\mathcal{P}(\gamma_q) = Y_0 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m_i \int_{q_i}^{q_{i+1}} t\xi''(t)dt - \frac{m_n}{2} \int_{q_n}^{q} t\xi''(t)dt - \frac{m_{n+1}}{2} \int_{q}^{1} t\xi''(t)dt. \tag{10}$$

In particular, we have $\lim_{q \to 1-} \Psi_{\gamma_q}(0, h) = \Psi_\gamma(0, h)$ and $\lim_{q \to 1-} \mathcal{P}(\gamma_q) = \mathcal{P}(\gamma)$.

2.2 Some auxiliary lemmas

We state two propositions that will be heavily used in our main proof in the next subsection. Let $0 \le a < t < b$ and $0 < m < m'$. Denote by z a standard normal random variable. Define

$$\begin{aligned} A(t,x) &= \frac{1}{m'} \log \mathbb{E} \exp m' \big| x + z\sqrt{b-t} \big|, \\ B(t,x) &= \frac{1}{m} \log \mathbb{E} \exp m A(t, x + z\sqrt{t-a}), \\ C(t,x) &= \mathbb{E} A_x^2(t, x + z\sqrt{t-a}) V(t, x, x + z\sqrt{t-a}), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where

$$V(t,x,y) = e^{m(A(t,y) - B(t,x))}.$$

Here $A_x(t,x)$ is the partial derivative of $A(t,x)$ in x. In what follows, we will adopt the same notation for $A_{xx}(t,x), A_t(t,x), B_t(t,x), C_t(t,x)$, etc. for the partial derivatives with respect to the subscripts. We will also consider these functions applied to random variables. Using again z to denote a standard Gaussian, we set $V = V(t,x,x+z\sqrt{t-a})$, $A_x = A_x(t, x+z\sqrt{t-a})$, etc.

The main results of this subsection are the following two propositions.

Proposition 1. *For any $(t,x) \in [a,b) \times \mathbb{R}$, we have that*

$$B_t(t,x) = \frac{(m-m')}{2} C(t,x) \tag{12}$$

and

$$C_t(t,x) = \mathbb{E}\big(A_{xx}^2 + 2(m-m')A_{xx}A_x^2\big)V + \frac{(m-m')m}{2}\big(\mathbb{E}A_x^4 V - \big(\mathbb{E}A_x^2 V\big)^2\big). \tag{13}$$

Remark 2. The functions (11) and the formula (12) also appeared in [29, Section 14.7] in a similar manner, where in the exponent of A, the author used the random variable $\beta^{-1}\log\cosh(\beta(x + z\sqrt{b-t}))$ instead of $|x + z\sqrt{b-t}|$.

Proposition 2. *We have that*

$$\lim_{t \to b-} C(t,x) = 1 \tag{14}$$

and

$$\liminf_{t \to b-} C_t(t,x) \ge \frac{2(m+m')}{3} \Delta(x),$$

where

$$\Delta(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi(b-a)}} \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2(b-a)}}}{\mathbb{E}e^{m|x+z\sqrt{b-a}|}}. \tag{15}$$

Before we turn to the proof of Propositions 1 and 2, we first gather some fundamental properties of the function A.

Lemma 1. *A is the classical solution to the following PDE with boundary condition $A(b,x)=|x|$,*

$$A_t(t,x) = -\frac{1}{2}\big(A_{xx}(t,x) + m' A_x(t,x)^2\big) \tag{16}$$

for $(t,x)\in[a,b)\times\mathbb{R}$. In addition,

$$|A_x(t,x)| \le 1,\ (t,x)\in[a,b)\times\mathbb{R}, \tag{17}$$

$$\lim_{t\to b-} A_x(t,x) = \mathrm{sign}(x),\ \forall x\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}, \tag{18}$$

$$\lim_{t\to b-} \mathbb{E}A_x^{2k}V = 1,\ \forall\, k\ge 1, \forall\, 0<m<m', \tag{19}$$

where $sign(x)=1$ if $x>0$ and $=-1$ if $x<0$.

Proof. Define

$$g(t,x) = e^{\frac{(b-t)m'^2}{2}+m'x}\Phi\Big(m'\sqrt{b-t}+\frac{x}{\sqrt{b-t}}\Big),$$

where Φ is the cumulative distribution function of a standard normal random variable. Note that a direct computation gives

$$\mathbb{E}e^{m'|x+z\sqrt{b-t}|} = g(t,x)+g(t,-x).$$

Thus,

$$A(t,x) = \frac{1}{m'}\log\big(g(t,x)+g(t,-x)\big).$$

From this expression, we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned}
A_x(t,x) &= \frac{g(t,x)-g(t,-x)}{g(t,x)+g(t,-x)},\\
A_{xx}(t,x) &= m'\Big(1-\Big(\frac{g(t,x)-g(t,-x)}{g(t,x)+g(t,-x)}\Big)^2\Big)+2\Gamma(t,x),\\
A_t(t,x) &= -\frac{m'}{2}-\Gamma(t,x),
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where

$$\Gamma(t,x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(b-t)}}\frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2(b-t)}}}{g(t,x)+g(t,-x)}.$$

Therefore, these equations together validate (16). From the first equation, we can also conclude (17) and (18). Note that $\lim_{t\to b-}V(t,x,y)=V(b,x,y)$ and $\ln V(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is at most of linear growth. From (17) and (18), the dominated convergence theorem implies (19).

□

Proof of Proposition 1. Recall that the Gaussian integration by parts states that for a standard normal random variable z, $\mathbb{E}zf(z)=\mathbb{E}f'(z)$ for all absolutely continuous functions f satisfying

that $\ln|f|$ is at most of linear growth at infinity. From this formula and the PDE (16), the partial derivative of B in t is given by

$$\begin{aligned} B_t(t,x) &= \mathbb{E}\big(A_t + \frac{z}{2\sqrt{t-a}}A_x\big)V \\ &= \mathbb{E}\big(-\frac{1}{2}\big(A_{xx} + m'A_x^2\big) + \frac{1}{2}\big(A_{xx} + mA_x^2\big)\big)V \\ &= \frac{m-m'}{2}\mathbb{E}A_x^2 V, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (12). To compute the partial derivative of C in t, write $C_t = I + II$, where

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= 2\mathbb{E}\Big(A_{tx} + \frac{z}{2\sqrt{t-a}}A_{xx}\Big)A_x V \\ II &:= m\mathbb{E}A_x^2\Big(A_t + \frac{z}{2\sqrt{t-a}}A_x - B_t(t,x)\Big)V. \end{aligned}$$

Here, from (16), since

$$A_{tx} = -\frac{1}{2}\big(A_{xxx} + 2m'A_{xx}A_x\big),$$

using the Gaussian integration by parts again gives

$$\begin{aligned} I &= 2\mathbb{E}\Big(A_{tx}A_x + \frac{1}{2}\big(A_{xxx}A_x + A_{xx}^2 + mA_{xx}A_x^2\big)\Big)V \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big(-A_x\big(A_{xxx} + 2m'A_{xx}A_x\big) + \big(A_{xxx}A_x + A_{xx}^2 + mA_{xx}A_x^2\big)\Big)V \\ &= \mathbb{E}\big(A_{xx}^2 + (m-2m')A_{xx}A_x^2\big)V. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, from (16),

$$\begin{aligned} II &= m\mathbb{E}\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\big(A_{xx}A_x^2 + m'A_x^4\big) + \frac{1}{2}\big(3A_{xx}A_x^2 + mA_x^4\big) - A_x^2 B_t(t,x)\Big)V \\ &= m\mathbb{E}A_{xx}A_x^2 V + \frac{(m-m')m}{2}\big(\mathbb{E}A_x^4 V - \big(\mathbb{E}A_x^2 V\big)^2\big). \end{aligned}$$

From these, (13) follows.

□

To handle the limits in Proposition 2, we need two lemmas.

Lemma 2. *For any odd $k \geq 1$, there exists a constant K independent of t such that*

$$\mathbb{E}A_x^{k-1}A_{xx}V \leq \frac{Ke^{m|x|}}{\sqrt{t-a}} \tag{21}$$

for all $t \in [a,b)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{t\to b-} \mathbb{E}A_x^{k-1}A_{xx}V = \frac{1}{k}\Delta(x), \tag{22}$$

where $\Delta(x)$ is defined in Proposition 2.

Proof. Define

$$D(t,x) = \mathbb{E}zA_x^k(t, x + z\sqrt{t-a})V(t, x, x + z\sqrt{t-a}).$$

Note that $|A_x(t,x)| \le 1$ and $B(t,x) \ge 0$. We have

$$V(t,x,y) = e^{m(A(t,y)-B(t,x))} \le e^{mA(t,0)+m|y|}.$$

Using the Gaussian integration by parts, we can write

$$D(t,x) = \sqrt{t-a}\mathbb{E}\big(kA_x^{k-1}A_{xx} + mA_x^{k+1}\big)V. \tag{23}$$

This and the previous inequality together imply (21) since

$$k\sqrt{t-a}\mathbb{E}A_x^{k-1}A_{xx}V \le D(t,x) \le e^{mA(a,0)+m|x|}\mathbb{E}|z|e^{m|z|\sqrt{b-a}},$$

where the first inequality used the fact that $k+1$ is even. Next, we verify (22). Note that from (17) and (18), the dominated convergence theorem implies

$$\lim_{t\to b-} D(t,x) = \frac{\mathbb{E}z\mathrm{sign}(x + z\sqrt{b-a})e^{m|x+z\sqrt{b-a}|}}{\mathbb{E}e^{m|x+z\sqrt{b-a}|}} = \sqrt{b-a}\big(\Delta(x) + m\big),$$

where the second equation used the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}z\mathrm{sign}(x + z\sqrt{b-a})e^{m|x+z\sqrt{b-a}|} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{x^2}{2(b-a)}} + m\sqrt{b-a}\mathbb{E}e^{m|x+z\sqrt{b-a}|}. \tag{24}$$

See the verification of this equation in the appendix. In addition, since $k+1$ is even, (19) yields

$$\lim_{t\to b-} \mathbb{E}A_x^{k+1}V = 1.$$

Thus, from (23) and the last two limits,

$$\Delta(x)\sqrt{b-a} + m\sqrt{b-a} = \lim_{t\to b-} D(t,x) = \sqrt{b-a}\big(k\lim_{t\to b-}\mathbb{E}A_x^{k-1}A_{xx}V + m\big),$$

from which (22) follows.

□

Lemma 3. *We have that*

$$\liminf_{t\to b-} \mathbb{E}A_{xx}^2 V \ge \frac{4m'}{3}\Delta(x).$$

Proof. Recall the middle equation of (20). We see that

$$A_{xx} = m'(1 - A_x^2) + 2\Gamma, \tag{25}$$

on $[a,b)\times\mathbb{R}$. Here $\Gamma = \Gamma(t, x + z\sqrt{b-a})$ as usual. Using (19), (25), and Lemma 2 with $k=1$ gives

$$\lim_{t\to b-} \mathbb{E}\Gamma V = \frac{1}{2}\Delta(x).$$

Also multiplying both sides of (25) by A_x^2 and applying (19) and Lemma 2 with $k=3$ yield

$$\lim_{t\to b-} \mathbb{E}A_x^2 \Gamma V = \frac{1}{6}\Delta(x).$$

From (25), since

$$\begin{aligned} A_{xx}^2 &= \big(m'(1-A_x^2)+2\Gamma\big)^2 \\ &\geq [m'(1-A_x^2)]^2 + 4m'(1-A_x^2)\Gamma, \end{aligned}$$

the announced result follows by the last two limits.

□

Proof of Proposition 2. The statement (14) follows from (11) and (19). From (13), Lemma 2, and Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{t\to b-} C_t(t,x) &\geq \liminf_{t\to b-} \mathbb{E}\big(A_{xx}^2 + 2(m-m')A_{xx}A_x^2\big)V \\ &\geq \liminf_{t\to b-} \mathbb{E}A_{xx}^2 V + 2(m-m') \lim_{t\to b-} \mathbb{E}A_{xx}A_x^2 V \\ &= \frac{4m'}{3}\Delta(x) + \frac{2(m-m')}{3}\Delta(x) \\ &= \frac{2(m+m')}{3}\Delta(x), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality used (19).

□

2.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Recall the sequences $(q_i)_{0\leq i\leq n+2}$ and $(m_i)_{0\leq i\leq n+1}$ from (7) and (9). Recall the quantities m, m', a, b and the functions A, B, C, V from (11). From now on, we take

$$\begin{aligned} m = m_n,\ m' = m_{n+1}, \\ a = \xi'(q_n),\ b = \xi'(1), \end{aligned}$$

and let

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}(q,x) &= A(\xi'(q),x), \\ \hat{B}(q,x) &= B(\xi'(q),x), \\ \hat{C}(q,x) &= C(\xi'(q),x), \\ \hat{V}(q,x,y) &= V(\xi'(q),x,y). \end{aligned}$$

For $0\leq i\leq n$, set

$$W_i = \exp m_i(Y_{i+1}-Y_i).$$

Denote

$$Z = h + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} z_j \sqrt{\xi'(q_{j+1}) - \xi'(q_j)},$$

and

$$\phi(q) = \mathbb{E}W_0\cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}(q,Z).$$

Lemma 4. *We have that*

$$\partial_q \mathcal{P}(\gamma_q) = \frac{\xi''(q)}{2}(m_{n+1} - m_n)\big(q - \phi(q)\big) \tag{26}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\phi'(q) = &\frac{\xi''(q)(m_n - m_{n+1})}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m_i \mathbb{E}\Big[W_0 \cdots W_i \big(\mathbb{E}_{i+1}\big[W_{i+1}\cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}(q,Z)\big]\big)^2\Big] \\ &- \frac{\xi''(q)(m_n - m_{n+1})}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m_i \mathbb{E}\Big[W_0 \cdots W_i \mathbb{E}_{z_i}\big[W_i\big(\mathbb{E}_{i+1}\big[W_{i+1}\cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}(q,Z)\big]\big)^2\big]\Big] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}W_0 \cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}_q(q,Z),\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_i$ is the expectation with respect to $z_i, \ldots, z_{n-1}$ and $\hat{C}_q$ is the partial derivative with respect to q.

Proof. Observe that for $0 \le i \le n-1$,

$$\partial_q Y_i = \mathbb{E}_{z_i} W_i \partial_q Y_{i+1}.$$

An induction argument yields

$$\partial_q Y_i = \mathbb{E}_i W_i \cdots W_{n-1} \partial_q Y_n$$

for $0 \le i \le n-1$. Since $Y_n = \hat{B}(q,Z)$, the equation (12) leads to

$$\partial_q Y_i = \frac{\xi''(q)(m_n - m_{n+1})}{2}\mathbb{E}_i W_i \cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}(q,Z). \tag{28}$$

From (10), since

$$\partial_q \mathcal{P}(\gamma_q) = \partial_q Y_0 + \frac{q\xi''(q)}{2}(m_{n+1} - m_n),$$

this and (28) with $i = 0$ yield (26). On the other hand, for $0 \le i \le n-1$, from (28),

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_q W_i &= m_i\big(\partial_q Y_{i+1} - \partial_q Y_i\big)W_i \\ &= \frac{\xi''(q)}{2}(m_n - m_{n+1})m_i W_i\big(\mathbb{E}_{i+1}W_{i+1}\cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}(q,Z) - \mathbb{E}_i W_i \cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}(q,Z)\big)\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{i+1}W_{i+1}\cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}(q,Z) = \hat{C}(q,Z)$ if $i = n-1$. Finally, since

$$\phi'(q) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\mathbb{E}W_0\cdots W_{i-1}(\partial_q W_i)W_{i+1}\cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}(q,Z) + \mathbb{E}W_0\cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}_q(q,Z),$$

plugging the last equation into this derivative yields (27).

□

Proof of Theorem 3. Recall $\phi'(q)$ from (27). Let $W_0', \ldots, W_{n-1}'$ be $W_0, \ldots, W_{n-1}$ evaluated at $q = 1$. Note that $\mathbb{E}_{z_i} W_i = 1$ for all $0 \le i \le n-1$ and $|\hat{C}| \le 1$ by (17). Applying Fatou's lemma

and conditional expectation yield that the first two lines of (27) cancel each other and as a result of Proposition 2,

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{q\to 1-}\phi'(q) &= \liminf_{q\to 1-}\mathbb{E}W_0\cdots W_{n-1}\hat{C}_q(q,Z)\\ &\geq \mathbb{E}W_0'\cdots W_{n-1}'\liminf_{q\to 1-}\hat{C}_q(q,Z)\\ &\geq \frac{2\xi''(1)(m_n+m_{n+1})}{3}\mathbb{E}W_0'\cdots W_{n-1}'\Delta(Z),\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $\Delta(Z)$ is defined through (15) with $a=\xi'(q_n)$, $b=\xi'(1)$, and $m=m_n$. We emphasize that although we do not know whether $\hat{C}_q$ is nonnegative (see (13)), the use of Fatou's lemma remains justifiable. Indeed, note that $|\hat{A}_x|\leq 1$, $\mathbb{E}_{z_n}\hat{V}=1$, and by (21),

$$0\leq \mathbb{E}_{z_n}\hat{A}_{xx}(q,Z)\hat{A}_x^2(q,Z)\hat{V}(q,Z,Z+z_n\sqrt{\xi'(q)-\xi'(q_n)})\leq \frac{Ke^{m_n|Z|}}{\sqrt{\xi'(q)-\xi'(q_n)}},$$

where K is a constant independent of q. From (13),

$$\hat{C}_q(q,Z)\geq -(m_{n+1}-m_n)\xi''(q)\Big(\frac{2Ke^{m_n|Z|}}{\sqrt{\xi'(q)-\xi'(q_n)}}+\frac{m_n}{2}\Big).$$

In addition, it can be shown that each $\ln\big(W_0W_1\cdots W_{n-1}\big)$ is at most of linear growth in $z_0,\ldots,z_{n-1}$ following from the fact that each Y_i is uniformly Lipschitz in the variable z_i for all $q\in[q_n,1]$. This and the last inequality together validates (29).

Next, from (29), we can choose m_{n+1} large enough at the beginning such that

$$\liminf_{q\to 1-}\phi'(q)>1.$$

Note that $\lim_{q\to 1-}\phi(q)=1$. From (26), the above inequality implies that $\partial_q\mathcal{P}(\gamma_q)<0$ for our choice of m_{n+1} as long as q is sufficiently close to 1. This completes our proof.

□

Remark 3. The validity of (29) and Theorem 3 relies on the positive lower bound of C_t coming from Proposition 2. When one looks at (13) together with the fact $\lim_{t\to b-}A_x^2=1$, it is tempting to think that C_t is actually negative since $m'=m_{n+1}$ is taken to be large. As a result, Proposition 2 may look counterintuitive. The remedy for this puzzle is the fact that A_{xx} is singular in the limit $t\to b-$ and the dominated convergence theorem does not apply. These "singular expectations" are one of the major difficulties to prove Theorem 3. They are handled by the exact computations coming from Lemmas 2 and 3.

3 Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

Proof of Theorem 1. We prove Theorem 1 by contradiction. First, note that it is known by [7, Theorem 6] that the Parisi measure γ_P is not constantly zero. Suppose that the support of γ_P consists of only $n\geq 1$ points. Then from Theorem 3, we can lower the value of the Parisi functional by a perturbation of γ_P at 1 defined in (8). This leads to a contradiction of the minimality of $\mathcal{P}(\gamma_P)$. Hence, the support of γ_P must contain infinitely many points.

□

Remark 4. The statement of Theorem 1 can be strengthened to the fact that the Parisi measure γ_P cannot be "flat" near 1, i.e., $\gamma_P(t) < \gamma_P(1-)$ for any $0 < t < 1$. In fact, if this is not true, then γ_P is a constant function on $[a, 1)$ for some a. One can then apply essentially the same argument as Proposition 3 to lower the Parisi functional. The only difference is that since γ_P is not necessarily a step function on $[0, a)$, the term $W_1 \cdots W_{n-1}$ in Lemma 4 have to be replaced by a continuous modification using the optimal stochastic control representation for Ψ_γ in [7]. We omit the details of the argument.

Remark 5. Our argument of Theorem 1 does not rely on the uniqueness of the Parisi measure. All we need is the existence of a Parisi measure which was proved in [4].

Proof of Theorem 2. Recall the Parisi measure $\alpha_{P,\beta}$ for the free energy from (2). We first claim that $(\beta\alpha_{P,\beta})_{\beta>0}$ converges to γ_P vaguely on $[0, 1)$. Suppose there exists an infinite sequence $(\beta_l)_{l\geq 1}$ such that $(\beta_l\alpha_{P,\beta_l})_{l\geq 1}$ does not converge to γ_P vaguely on $[0, 1)$. By an identical argument as [4, Equation (16)], we can further pass to a subsequence of $(\beta_l\alpha_{P,\beta_l})_{l\geq 1}$ such that it vaguely converges to some γ on $[0, 1)$. To ease our notation, we use $(\beta_l\alpha_{P,\beta_l})_{l\geq 1}$ to standard for this subsequence. It was established in [4, Lemma 3] that

$$\lim_{l\to\infty} F_{\beta_l} \geq \mathcal{P}(\gamma).$$

From this,

$$\mathcal{P}(\gamma_P) = \lim_{\beta\to\infty} F_\beta \geq \mathcal{P}(\gamma).$$

From the uniqueness of γ_P established in [7, Theorem 4], it follows that $\gamma_P = \gamma$, a contradiction. Thus, $(\beta\alpha_{P,\beta})_{\beta>0}$ converges to γ_P vaguely on $[0, 1)$. This completes the proof of our claim.

Next, if Theorem 2 does not hold, then from the above claim, there exists some $k \geq 1$ such that the support of $\alpha_{P,\beta}$ contains at most k points for all sufficiently large β. This implies that the support of γ_P contains at most k points. This contradicts Theorem 1.

□

Appendix

Denote by $\Phi(x)$ the c.d.f. of the standard normal distribution. The following lemma follows a standard Gaussian computation and is used in (24).

Lemma 5. *Suppose that z is a standard normal random variable. For any $x, m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}ze^{m|x+az|}\text{sign}(x + az) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}e^{-\frac{x^2}{2a^2}} + ma\mathbb{E}e^{m|x+az|}.$$

Proof. Define

$$f(y) = e^{my}\Phi\Big(\frac{y}{a} + ma\Big),$$

for $y \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\Phi(x)$ is the c.d.f. of the standard Gaussian random variable. Note that

$$amz - \frac{z^2}{2} = -\frac{1}{2}(z - ma)^2 + \frac{m^2a^2}{2}.$$

Computing directly gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}ze^{m(x+az)}\mathbf{1}_{\{x+az>0\}} &= \frac{e^{mx}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-x/a}^{\infty} ze^{amz-\frac{z^2}{2}}dz \\ &= \frac{e^{mx+\frac{m^2a^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-x/a}^{\infty}(z-ma)e^{-\frac{(z-ma)^2}{2}}dz + \frac{mae^{mx+\frac{m^2a^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-x/a}^{\infty}e^{-\frac{(z-ma)^2}{2}}dz \\ &= \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2a^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + mae^{\frac{m^2a^2}{2}}f(x).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $z' := -z$ is a standard Gaussian random variable, we may apply the above formula to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}ze^{-m(x+az)}1_{\{x+az<0\}} &= -\mathbb{E}(-z)e^{m((-x)+a(-z))}1_{\{-x+a(-z)>0\}} \\ &= -\mathbb{E}z'e^{m((-x)+az')}1_{\{-x+az'>0\}} \\ &= -\frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2a^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} - mae^{\frac{m^2a^2}{2}}f(-x).\end{aligned}$$

Combining these two equations together leads to

$$\mathbb{E}ze^{m(x+az)}1_{\{x+az>0\}} - \mathbb{E}ze^{-m(x+az)}1_{\{x+az<0\}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}e^{-\frac{x^2}{2a^2}} + mae^{\frac{m^2a^2}{2}}\big(f(x)+f(-x)\big).$$

Here, note that

$$\mathbb{E}e^{m|x+az|} = e^{\frac{m^2a^2}{2}+xm}\Phi\Big(\frac{x}{a}+am\Big) + e^{\frac{m^2a^2}{2}-xm}\Phi\Big(-\frac{x}{a}+am\Big) = e^{\frac{m^2a^2}{2}}\big(f(x)+f(-x)\big).$$

This and the last equation together imply the announced result.

□

References

[1] Aizenman, M., Lebowitz, J. L., Ruelle, D.: Some rigorous results on the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick spin glass model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **112**, 3–20, (1987).

[2] Auffinger, A., Chen, W.-K.: On properties of Parisi Measures. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **161**, no. 3, 817–850, (2015).

[3] Auffinger, A., Chen, W.-K.: The Parisi formula has a unique minimizer. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **335**, no. 3, 1429–1444, (2015).

[4] Auffinger, A., Chen, W.-K.: Parisi formula for the ground state energy in the mixed p-spin model. arXiv:1606.05335, (2016).

[5] Auffinger, A., Chen, W.-K.: On the energy landscape near the maximum energy in the spherical mixed even p-spin model. arXiv:1702.08906, (2017).

[6] Aizenman, M., Sims, R., Starr, S. L.: An extended variational principle for the SK spin-glass model. *Phys. Rev.* B. **68**, 214403 (2003).

[7] Chen, W.-K., Handschy, M., Lerman, G.: On the energy landscape of the mixed even p-spin model. arXiv:1609.04368, (2016).

[8] Dembo, A., Montanari, A., Sen, S.: Extremal cuts of sparse random graphs. arXiv:1503.03923, (2015).

[9] Derrida, B.: The discovery of the broken symmetry of replicas. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General,* **49**(45), 451001, (2016).

[10] Edwards, S. F., Anderson, P. W.: Theory of spin glasses. *Journal of Physics F: Metal Physics*, **5**(5):965, (1975).

[11] Ghirlanda, S., Guerra, F.: General properties of overlap probability distributions in disordered spin systems. Towards Parisi ultrametricity. *J. Phys.* A **31**, no. 46, 91499155 (1998).

[12] Guerra, F.: Broken replica symmetry bounds in the mean field spin glass model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **233**, no. 1, (2003).

[13] Mézard, M., Parisi, G., Virasoro, M.: Spin glass theory and beyond. World Scientific, **9**, Singapore, (2004).

[14] Mézard, M., Montanari, A.: Information, physics, and computation, *Oxford University Press*, (2009).

[15] Jagannath, A., Tobasco, I.: A dynamic programming approach to the Parisi functional. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **144**, 3135–3150, (2016).

[16] Panchenko, D.: The Parisi ultrametricity conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, **177**:383–393, (2012).

[17] Panchenko, D.: The Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, (2013).

[18] Panchenko, D.: The Parisi formula for mixed p-spin models. *Ann. Probab.*, **42**, no. 3, 946–958, (2014).

[19] Parisi, G.: Infinite number of order parameters for spin-glasses. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **43**, 1754–1756, (1979).

[20] Parisi, G.: A sequence of approximate solutions to the SK model for spin glasses. *J. Phys. A*, **13**(4):L–115, (1980).

[21] Parisi, G.: The order parameter for spin glasses: A function on the interval 0-1. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General,* **13**(3), 1101, (1980).

[22] Parisi, G.: Order parameter for spin-glasses. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **50**(24), 1946, (1983).

[23] Parisi, G.: Field Theory, Disorder and Simulation. World Scientific Publishing Company, (1992).

[24] Sen, S.: Optimization on sparse random hypergraphs and spin glasses. arXiv:1606.02365, (2016).

[25] Sherrington, D., Kirkpatrick, S.: Solvable model of a spin-glass. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **35**(26):1792–1796, (1975).

[26] Subag, E.: The complexity of spherical p-spin models - a second moment approach. arXiv:1504.02251, (2015).

[27] Talagrand, M.: Spin Glasses: A Challenge for Mathematicians: Cavity and Mean Field Models. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, **46**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (2003).

[28] Talagrand, M.: The Parisi formula. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, **163**, no. 1, 221–263, (2006).

[29] Talagrand, M.: Mean field models for spin glasses. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, **55**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (2011).

[30] Toninelli, F.: About the Almeida-Thouless transition line in the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick mean field spin glass model. *Europhysics letters*, **60**, no. 50, 764–767, (2002).